



—Wide World.

Berkeley students maintain a vigil outside Sproul Hall as sit-in demonstrators are forcibly removed by police on December 3.

WHAT HAPPENED AT BERKELEY

By JAMES CASS

BERKELEY, CALIF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA at Berkeley, where a series of student demonstrations erupted last fall, is, paradoxically, reaping the fruits of success. For many years Berkeley, most prestigious of the university's eight campuses, has sought to build a faculty whose eminence would be second to none, and to attract a student body that would rival the nation's best. To a very large degree it has succeeded—but it has not yet learned to cope effectively with its success.

For reasons of size, circumstance, and personality, pressures within the student body have long been building. In a year when the issue of human equality and its twin supports—freedom of speech and of political action—have been posed so dramatically for the whole nation by the civil rights

movement, it is not surprising that Berkeley's politically aware students should be especially sensitive. When, therefore, the administration abruptly closed a campus safety valve shortly before the fall term opened, the result, predictably, was an explosion of massive proportions that has rocked this great institution to its foundations. And the end is not yet in sight. Given the most sensitive administration handling of the situation—which it certainly has not received to date—it will be many months before the scars of recent events are healed. Meanwhile, it remains to be seen whether the university can survive without serious, permanent damage.

There is general agreement on the chronology of events; there is far less agreement on why they occurred and what they mean for higher education generally. Briefly, these are the facts:

The university has for many years had regulations "prohibiting the collec-

tion of funds and the use of university facilities for the planning and implementing of off-campus political and social action." However, a small, brick-paved area about twenty-six by sixty feet immediately outside Sather Gate on the south side of the campus—the main entrance for pedestrians—provided an outlet for the social and political conscience of the campus community. Here students with a "cause" have, for many years, set up their card tables, easels, and placards, passed out handbills and flyers, solicited funds and recruited converts.

It was in this area, at the corner of Telegraph and Bancroft, that student volunteers for William Scranton were recruited during the Republican National Convention. It was here that students were recruited by the Ad Hoc Committee to End Discrimination to picket the Oakland *Tribune* on September 4, for alleged discrimination in hiring—a charge that has been strongly

denied by former Senator William F. Knowland, editor of the paper and a leading supporter of Senator Goldwater in California. It was here, too, that students were sought for picketing and sit-ins at other business establishments in neighboring San Francisco.

This was the situation when, on September 14, Dean of Students Katherine A. Towle pulled the string. In a letter to all student organizations and their advisors, she reminded them of university regulations and announced that beginning September 21 solicitation of funds and recruitment of members for social and political causes were henceforth banned from the formerly exempt area outside Sather Gate as well as from the campus proper. The safety valve was closed.

WITHIN a matter of days after September 14 some twenty student organizations had formed a United Front coalition to oppose the university's action. These groups were notable primarily for the remarkable diversity of viewpoints they represented. They included Slate (a vociferously liberal student political organization), Campus CORE, California Council of Republicans, University Society of Individualists, W.E.B. DuBois Club, Young Peoples Socialist League, University Young Democrats, University Young Republicans, Young Socialist Alliance, Campus Women for Peace, Youth for Goldwater, Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, Student Committee for "No on Proposition 14", University Friends of SNCC, Students for a Democratic Society, College Young Republicans, Students for Independent Political Action, Youth Committee Against Proposition 14, Independent Socialist Club, and the Inter-Faith Council.

The administration responded to formation of the United Front by liberalizing the rules to permit distribution of information, but denied the right to advocate or organize social or political action. The students rejected the proposal and, on September 21, the United Front held its first rally on the steps of Sproul Hall, the university administration building, hard by Sather Gate.

A week later, on September 28, the administration reinterpreted its rules to allow distribution of campaign literature and similar materials, and designated eight "Hyde Park" areas on campus where discussion and debate of social and political issues could take place, but it announced also that those engaging in "illegal politics" might be expelled. Since there had for many years been serious questions about the constitutionality of the university's restrictions on student activity, a number of United Front organizations, in an effort to make a test case, deliberately

defied the university regulations by manning tables to organize political and social action. On September 30 the university "indefinitely suspended" eight students involved in the test case, and 400 other students promptly signed statements that they were equally guilty and demanded disciplinary hearings. The stage was set for the fantastic events that followed.

The next day a protest rally was held on the steps of Sproul Hall. A former graduate student in mathematics, Jack Weinberg, who was manning a CORE table on Sproul steps, was arrested for trespassing and placed in a police car that had been driven onto the campus sidewalk. A crowd of some 3,000 students promptly enveloped the police car and held it captive, with Weinberg inside, for more than thirty hours—from approximately noon of October 1 to early evening of the following day. Meanwhile, students had entered Sproul Hall and initiated a sit-in to demand discussion of the eight students who had been suspended, but they left voluntarily after a brief clash with the police.

On October 2, university officials, members of the faculty, and student leaders met to discuss their differences. In the course of the meeting, students agreed to a moratorium on illegal protests, the administration agreed to submit the cases of the eight suspended students to the Academic Senate, powerful official organization of the whole Berkeley faculty, and a ten-man committee of faculty, administration representatives, and students was appointed to investigate campus problems and recommend solutions. As a result, the 450 police who had assembled to force removal of the police car departed, the demonstrators dispersed, and Weinberg was booked, but released, since the university had agreed not to press charges.

At about this same time, the United Front coalition was reorganized as the Free Speech Movement (FSM) under the leadership of Mario Savio, a senior philosophy major, a frequent speaker at student rallies, and one of the eight students who had been suspended. The new organization proved to be a highly organized but loosely structured organization that attracted and used effectively a wide range of student talent, and that displayed a sure sense of political strategy in dealing with the administration.

The new name of the organization was psychologically effective, but hardly accurate since the question at issue was whether students had the right on campus to solicit funds, seek recruits, and make plans for off-campus political and social action, mainly in the field of civil rights, aimed at the surrounding

community. The Hyde Park areas on campus offered ample opportunity for traditional freedom of speech.

In the days that followed, the Academic Senate passed a resolution favoring "maximum freedom for student political activity," and President Clark Kerr (chief administrative officer of the state-wide university—each campus is administered by its own chancellor) asked the Academic Senate to set up an *ad hoc* committee to advise on disciplining the eight suspended students. On October 21 the committee requested that the chancellor reinstate the suspended students temporarily, pending their hearing and a report, but the request was denied.

ON November 5, impatient with a deadlock within the faculty-student-administration committee, FSM resumed picketing of Sproul Hall. This action was followed four days later by a rally, and tables were again manned on Sproul steps in defiance of university regulations. Some sixty to seventy students were ordered to appear before the dean and 800 other students promptly signed statements declaring that they were equally guilty. The administration then disbanded the faculty-student-administration committee, charging that FSM had violated the truce agreement.

On November 12 the *ad hoc* committee of the Academic Senate considering disciplinary action against the eight suspended students criticized the administration as "harsh and arbitrary" in its handling of these cases and recommended censure for six of the students and suspension for six weeks for the other two, Savio and Art Goldberg.

When the Regents, governing body of the university, on November 20 held their regular monthly meeting on the Berkeley campus, they accepted the recommendation of President Kerr and Chancellor Strong for suspension of all eight students for the period from September 30 to November 20, and for placing Savio and Goldberg on probation. At the same time, the Regents took a long step toward meeting student demands by modifying previous policy to allow, in certain designated areas, "planning, implementing, raising funds or recruiting participants for lawful off-campus action." Advocacy of action that might prove unlawful, however, remained subject to university discipline.

Students reacted to this modification of the regulations by holding another rally on Sproul steps and marching to University Hall where the Regents were meeting. Two days later they again demonstrated their displeasure over the university's insistence on re-

(Continued on page 66)

NEWTON: PIPELINE FROM HARVARD

By PETER SHRAG, *Assistant Secretary of Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.*

THE CITY OF NEWTON, a Boston suburb of 92,000 people, is a loose amalgam of ten postal addresses held together by prestige and an outstanding school system. Education is Newton's central topic of conversation, its basic industry, and its most compelling reason for existence. In Newton, the superintendent of schools earns half again as much as the mayor and even the Taxpayers Association is reluctant to attack the educational budget.

Depending on the list consulted—and assuming such lists mean something—the Newton school system is either the best, the second best, or one of the top ten in the country. If you ask the seventeen-year-old bellboy at the Charter-

This description of the school system of Newton, Massachusetts, is drawn from a chapter in a forthcoming book by Mr. Shrag on the nature of education in contrasting American communities, to be published next fall by Beacon Press.

house Motel about the schools, he will quote you the most recent educational survey or the latest think-piece in *Time*. If you sit at the soda fountain of the drug store at Newton Corner, you will be told, without having asked, that the kid who served your Coke has had a bad day in school, and that he will get the results of his College Board tests tomorrow. If you read James B. Conant, you will learn that Newton's schools "are said by many to be representative of the lighthouse schools that point the way to excellence in education."

There are about 19,000 children in the Newton system, which includes twenty-five elementary schools, five junior high schools, two comprehensive senior high schools, a technical high school, and a junior college. What the junior college lacks in prestige, the rest of the system makes up in spades. Although Newton has a significant working-class minority, it ranks second among Massachusetts cities in the level of education attained by its adult population; it is wealthy, and is willing to commit some of its wealth to the great local enterprise. Newton is one of the "have" com-

munities in education; here education is a religion, and almost everyone is a true believer.

The circuits of ideas, of attitudes, and of techniques that characterize the Newton system are more likely to originate at Harvard or MIT than they are in the community, or even in the school committee. College professors work with teachers to develop curricula in history and the social sciences; materials such as those produced by the university-oriented Physical Science Study Committee and the School Mathematics Study Group are being used in Newton classes; the high schools are divided into "houses," "research papers" begin in the seventh grade, paperback books are on sale in the high school libraries, and academic consultants are brought in by the score to discuss special problems. The marriage between Newton and the nearby graduate schools of education is of such long standing that no one even bothers to mention it: Newton's first "joint" appointment with Harvard dates back some forty years.

The Harvard atmosphere is not restricted to the formal activities of the

A high school student works with pre-school youngsters in a nursery program as part of her home economics course.

—Newton Public Schools.

